

## REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-30. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 have been amended. Claims 28-30 have been added. No new matter has been added as a result of claim amendments.

### 35 U.S.C. §103

#### CLAIMS 1-9 and 19-24

Claims 1-9 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,194 (hereinafter, Johnson) in view of Kane et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,429 (hereinafter, Kane). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### CLAIMS 1-9

Currently Amended Claim 1 recites:

- A method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:
- a) receiving a call from an application program, said call specifying a user identifier and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information;
  - b) in response to said call, determining the location of said requested information corresponding to said user identifier by:
    - b1) determining a plurality of fields associated with said requested set of information; and
    - b2) accessing a stored mapping of said fields to said databases;
  - c) using said user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a first of said plurality of fields from a first of said plurality of databases;
  - d) using said user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a second of said plurality of fields from a second of said plurality of databases; and
  - e) providing said set of information to said application program, retrieved from said first and second databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database.

Amended Claim 1 recites that the set of information retrieved from the first and second databases is provided to the application program without requiring storage on an intermediate database. Johnson fails to teach or suggest retrieval from multiple databases, as claimed. Kane may search multiple databases, but the retrieved information is stored. Hence, Kane fails to teach or suggest, "providing said set of information retrieved from said first and second databases to said application program, without requiring storage on an intermediate databases," as claimed. As neither Johnson nor Kane teach or suggest this claimed limitation, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Johnson in view of Kane.

Amended Claim 1 further recites that, in response to said call, the location of requested information is retrieved by determining a plurality of fields associated with said requested set of information. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification in Figure 3 and at page 15, lines 10-11. Neither Johnson nor Kane teach this claimed limitation. Johnson teaches searching for information in response to an application program request that comprises a query comprising operands and operators. For example, an operand may be acct=checking or, alternatively, date > 1/1/98. The API Johnson teaches then searches for objects having an account parameter equal to checking or, alternatively, a data parameter greater than Jan. 1, 1998 (col., 2, lines 21-33). Applicants do not understand this to be determining, in response to a call, a plurality of fields associated with said requested set of information.

Kane fails to remedy this deficiency in Johnson. Kane may teach a system in which there exists a mapping of fields from a target database to fields in source databases (col. 2, lines 5-7). However, Applicants do not understand Kane to teach or suggest in response to a call, determining a plurality of fields associated with a requested set of information, as claimed. As neither Johnson nor Kane teach or suggest this claimed limitation, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Johnson in view of Kane.

Amended Claim 1 further recites that, using a user identifier, information is retrieved from first and second databases. Thus, an application program requests information that is retrieved from multiple databases and returned to the application program. Neither Johnson nor Kane teach using a user identifier, retrieving information from first and second databases, as claimed. For reasons already discussed, Johnson does not teach or suggest retrieving information from a first and a second database. The rejection asserts that Kane teaches retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases. Applicants respectfully point out that the recited limitation in Claim 1 is using said user identifier, retrieving information ... from a second of said plurality of databases.

For the foregoing rationale, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Johnson in view of Kane. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully submitted.

Claim 6 recites:

The method of Claim 4 wherein said update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of said application program, said activity being related to said information.

Claim 6 further recites that one of the fields is updated by writing to a database, based upon monitoring the user's activity. It is respectfully asserted that neither Johnson nor Kane, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this claimed limitation. The Office Action cites Kane at col. 2, line 45 – col. 3 line 35 in support of this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out more specifically where Kane teaches or suggests monitoring activity of a user, as claimed. Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 6 is not rendered obvious over Johnson in view of Kane. As such, allowance of Claim 6 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 2-5 and 7-9 depend from Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance of Claims 2-5 and 7-9 is earnestly solicited.

#### CLAIMS 19-24

Amended Claim 19 recites similar limitations as discussed with respect to Claim 1. For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, allowance of Claim 19 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 20-24 depend from Claim 19, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance of Claims 20-24 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 28

Claim 28 has been added. Support for Claim 28 may be found in the Specification at page 12, line 23 – page 13, line 4 and in Figure 1.

New Claim 28 recites:

The method of Claim 1, further comprising repeating said a) – e) for application programs that are compliant with different programming languages from one other.

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of New Claim 28. As such, allowance of Claim 28 is earnestly solicited.

CLAIMS 10-18 and 25-27

Claims 10-18 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr, U.S. Pat. No. 6,085,976 (hereinafter Sehr) in view of Kane, U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,429 (hereinafter Kane). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 recites, in part:

said program further operable to retrieve said information from at least two of said databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database, said information corresponding to said user identified by said request from said application program.

Claim 10 recites that the program is able to retrieve information corresponding to at least a first of a plurality of fields from at least two of said databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database. The information corresponds to a user identified by the request from the application program. Thus, the application can receive information from multiple databases with a single request, without the information being stored in an intermediate database. It is respectfully asserted that neither Sehr nor Kane, alone or in combination, teach or suggest these limitations in the claimed fashion.

Sehr may teach a number of databases that can be interacted with, such as a travel center or service provider. However, Applicants do not understand Sehr to teach or suggest a program retrieving information from multiple databases in response to a single request from an application program, without requiring storage on an intermediate database.

Kane teaches storing retrieved information on an intermediate database. Therefore, Kane fails to teach or suggest a program retrieving information from multiple databases in response to a single request from an application program, without requiring storage on an intermediate database.

For the foregoing rationale, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious over Sehr in view of Kane. As such, allowance of Claim 10 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 11-18 depend from Claim 10, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance of Claims 10-18 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 25 recites similar limitations as Claim 10. For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 10, allowance of Claim 25 is respectfully submitted.

Claims 26-27 depend from Claim 25, which is believed to be allowable for the above rationale. As such, allowance of Claims 26-27 is earnestly solicited.

#### Claims 29-30

Claims 29-30 have been added. Support for Claims 29-30 may be found in the Specification at page 12, line 23 – page 13, line 4 and in Figure 1.

New Claim 29 recites:

The computer readable medium of Claim 10, wherein said program is further operable to process requests originating from more than one programming language.

New Claim 30 recites:

The computer readable medium of Claim 10, wherein said program is further operable to process requests originating from more than one computing platform.

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of New Claims 29-30. As such, allowance of Claim 29-30 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-30 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-30 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: <u>6/2</u> , 2003	Respectfully submitted, WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP <u>Ronald M. Pomerence</u> Ronald M. Pomerence Registration No. 43,009
Address:	WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Two North Market Street Third Floor San Jose, California 95113
Telephone:	(408) 938-9060 Voice (408) 938-9069 Facsimile